8

REMARKS

UPON A

PAMPHLET,

INTIT'L'D,

A REVIEW *of the Controverſy about the Meaning of Demoniacs*, &c.

WHEREIN

The SERMON,

Which aſſerteth the uſual interpretation, *&c.* is vindicated from every exception of the REVIEWER,

BY

THOMAS HUTCHINSON, *D. D.*

Of *Hart-Hall* in *Oxford*,

and PREBENDARY of *Chicheſter*.

LONDON,

Printed for W. INNYS and R. MANBY at the Weſt End of St. *Paul's*. MDCCXXXIX.

REMARKS

PREFACE.

IN *theſe* Remarks *the author of the* Review *is patiently follow'd thro' every ſentence of his work, which relateth to the* Sermon. *And, ſhou'd there ſometimes appear a jejuneneſs in the progreſs, the conſiderate reader will be pleas'd to impute the fault to the nature of the* Review. *The* Remarks *deſcend to a minute examination of it, (not becauſe it deſerv'd ſuch attention, but) leſt the author might fancy, that the unanſwer'd parts were really unanſwerable. And, even whil'ſt the weakneſs of certain writers is expos'd, they will be reveng'd, in ſome meaſure, on each adverſary, by infuſing into his compoſitions a tincture of their own futility.*

But, the excellencies of our author's performance muſt not be diſſembled. The judgment, *then, which is diſplay'd in the conduct of it, is confeſſed abundantly ſufficient to* ſurprize; *and the* urbanity, *wherewith it is ſeaſon'd, equally qualify'th it to* divert. *Throout the whole are diffus'd undoubted evidences of a ſingular* love of truth: *and, in diſcuſſing the* references, *the author hath uniformly*

maintain'd a conſiderable figure, *by prudently ſubſtituting a* part *for the* whole.

The author ſeemeth to lay much ſtreſs on the authority of Mr. Mede — *Is he, on other occaſions, uſually diſpos'd to pay deference to authority? And, can he be ignorant, that the authority of* many, *equal at leaſt, if not ſuperior, to Mr.* Mede, *in learning and judgment, might be produc'd againſt his opinion?*

Several famous men, 'tis true, beſides the learned Mr. Mede, *have advanc'd the ſame opinion. And, about the cloſe of the* Sermon, *it is ſay'd* — " *If he (the author of the* En-
" quiry, *&c.) did not know, that* Pomponatius, Vaninus, Hobbs, Spinoza *and* Bekker
" *eſpecially, had all patroniſ'd the ſame opi-
" nion; he may, perhaps, when he cometh to
" this knowledg, congratulate himſelf upon
" the lucky coincidence of his own thoughts
" with the thoughts of men, diſtinguiſh'd by
" ſingular penetration. If he was not a
" ſtranger to their concurrence, their cara-
" cters might have juſtify'd a ſuſpicion, at
" leaſt, of the doctrin, and occaſion'd a more
" accurate inquiry into the foundation of it, be-
" fore it was eſpous'd and publickly reviv'd."

With this reflexion the Reviewer *is incens'd: and immediately recurring (agreeably to the ſuggeſtions of nature, in caſes of diſtreſs) to his chief inſtrument of defence, he cryeth out*— " [1] *It was* impertinent *to talk in that manner
" in a Pulpit* — " *It ſtill ſeemeth* very per-

[1] Review, p. 64.

tinent

tinent *to point out the perſons, who join'd* this *with their other abuſes of holy Scripture; and, from violating it's language, made an eaſy tranſition to the eluſion of it's authority. The young are hereby taught the fatal reſtleſneſs of error, and the danger of aſſenting to ſuch comments, in regard to one point, as tend to ſpread ambiguity thro'out the whole ſacred Text.*

We are not, indeed, aſſur'd that, in any future inquiries, the ſame violent method of interpretation will be apply'd to the great myſteries of our faith. Yet, how well our Author is prepar'd to uſe it, at leaſt, in perverting ſome important inſtructions, that occur in holy Scripture [1], *may be eaſily collected from his harangue* [2] *againſt the perſuaſion, that* "poor Men *(ſo* pitifully *do'th he talk)* may "be artfully ſeduc'd from the Ways of Vir- "tue and Religion by inviſible, ſpiritual "Enemies."

Shou'd any readers be hereupon diſpos'd to aſk — To what purpoſe, then, have St. Paul, *St.* James *and St.* Peter *deliver'd the directions, which are extant in the places referr'd to? — our author can furniſh them with an eaſy ſolution, in his way, by acquainting them, that tho'* διάβολος, *in a* certain *book, is vulgarly ſuppos'd to denote an* evil, ſpiritual, deluding, powerful *Being; yet, in other good writings, (to him well known) the word can*

[1] See *Eph.* iv. 27. vi. 11. *James* iv. 7. 1 *Pet.* v. 8.
[2] Review, p. 26, 27.

only

only signify, in the utmost extent of it's power, a sly, gloomy, intriguing, malicious accuser of his brethren. *Thus will it plainly enough appear, that those apostles may be fairly understood only to have given cautions against* dark, designing fellows, — *such as, in* their *times, infested the Christian church; and such, as it is thought not to be intirely free from, in the* present.

Our author (in the common strain of anti-scripturists) [1] *talks of* "ridiculous notions, blended with the true religion"; *or such, as may provoke* [2] "high ridicule." *This same tremendous argument* — "high ridicule" — *was in great vogue amongst some antient unbelievers: and the exquisite subtlety, which it sheweth, in conjunction with its astonishing strength, must be suppos'd to have recommended it to the use of their judicious successors, in the laudable work of torturing and deriding the Scriptures. Nevertheless, each reviver of this old device may be contented with an old admonition (which the* Reviewer *is left to find, without a reference)* Επίσχες — παρεὶς τὸν προπετῆ γέλωτα.

But, our author seemeth to give kind notice [3], *that dangerous attacks may be expected from unbelievers,* "*who have* Eyes *(as he sa-* "*gaciously observeth) to see our Weakness,* "*and* Hands *ready to expose us.*" *How weak*

[1] Review, p. 4.
[2] A sort of cant-phrase in the *Enquiry* and *Review*.
[3] Review, p. 4.

he

he and his friends are, and how liable to be expos'd, it became him to conſider, before he undertook the office of a Reviewer. *But, cou'd he prevail with the infidels (whoſe dreadful, well-known* eyes *and* hands *ſeem to have made a deep impreſſion upon him) to imploy their* eyes *in reading proper books, they can never, conſiſtently with any degree of modeſty, imploy their* hands *in committing to paper ſuch crude, profane reveries, as they have been long accuſtom'd to obtrude upon the publick. How they are incourag'd to repeat their abuſes of the preſs, it may be difficult to ſay; unleſs the irreligious tenor of their productions may, amongſt their acquaintance, be thought ſufficient attonement for their dulneſs; and give them an air of ſignificancy, whil'ſt it ingageth ſome to read, and ſome moreover to refute them — ſuch to read them with delight, as contemn* Revelation — *and ſuch to refute them, as regard that contempt with juſt concern.*

In the courſe of the Remarks, *the* Inquirer *and the* Reviewer *have been conſider'd, as the ſame individual. Shou'd there be a miſtake herein, and ſhou'd each be to the other only* another learned *and* ingenious ſelf, *the miſtake will be acknowledg'd, whenever the one ſhall think fit to ſtep out of the crowd of* Philaleths, *and the other favour us with more clear diſcoveries of himſelf, than can be collected from the* numerous, ambiguous marks of his extraordinary merit.

REMARKS

ERRATA.

P. 25. l. 10. for ἄλλων r. ἄλλου.
30. l. 23. after *Men*, add, *more unworthy of Christians.*

REMARKS

UPON A

PAMPHLET,

INTIT'L'D,

A REVIEW *of the Controverſy about the Meaning of Demoniacs*, &c.

THE examination of the Sermon, which aſſerteth the *uſual interpretation*, &c. is thus introduc'd — "[1] The difference betwixt Mr. *Hutchinſon* "and the *Enquirer* would ſoon be at an "End, had he produc'd Authorities an- "tienter than the New Teſtament for the Uſe "of the Word δαίμων in the Senſe he under- "ſtands it." Here the author diſcovereth a

[1] Review, *p.* 16.

ſymptom, that may ſeem hopeful enough, at the firſt view. But it, alas! (like the language, which his demoniacs will ſometimes utter) taketh a ſudden and unpromiſing change. For, thus he immediately proceeds—

"But with all the Pomp of References that "his Margins are ſtuff'd with, there is not ſo "much as one that is as antient as the New "Teſtament, that is to his purpoſe."[1] Who wou'd not be pleas'd even with the ſeverity of a ſentence, that is pronounc'd with ſuch decency and elegance? Yet, what expoſtulations might have been expected from this delicate writer, had thoſe offenſive margins appear'd without references?

It cannot be ſuppos'd, indeed, that the method of directing the reader to authorities, which I have choſen to uſe, ſhou'd be approv'd by any modern dealers in antiſcriptural cavils. Theſe are generally contented with repeating ſuch citations, as they find already made; and, if they produce the name only of an author, their intimate acquaintance with him muſt, in compliance with their modeſt expectations, be acknowledged. Writers, leſs adventurous, will not refuſe the Public even the lower inſtances of their diligence. And, in treating ſubjects, where authorities are requir'd, thoſe may ſeem to conſult their own reputation, as well as their reader's convenience, moſt ſucceſsfully, who draw off the ſentiments of the authors cited, with fidelity;

[1] Review, *ibid.*

repreſent

repreſent them digeſted and connected, with propriety and perſpicuity; and then refer, with accuracy, to the places, wherein they occur. Recourſe to the ſeveral originals is hereby facilitated; ſuſpicions of unfair practice prevented; or, at leaſt, the more curious reader is inabled, without loſs of time, to remove the ſuſpicions, which he may have conceiv'd.

This digreſſion may, perhaps, be wonder'd at — It is chiefly made for the ſake of the *Reviewer*; that he may hereafter learn to diſtinguiſh between pomp and propriety.

II.

What? ſhall our *judg of pertinence and good writing* acknowledg the propriety of references, " *not ſo much as one of which is to* " *the purpoſe?* The thing requir'd (for thus " he goes on) is to produce an inſtance of the " word δαίμονες ſignifying malevolent, maleſi- " cent Beings, delighting or delighted in pro- " moting wickedneſs amongſt men." [1]

Here the author begins to diſplay his dexterity. In the Sermon [2], δαίμονες are, indeed, called Beings " delighting, or *ſeeming*, at leaſt, " delighted, in the indulgence, *&c.*" Our author's omiſſion of the qualifying term cannot be look'd upon as a fault of the preſs. It is omitted a ſecond time, in this ſame page; and alſo in pages 19, 27, 36, 38 of the *Review*. If he *cou'd not* diſtinguiſh between real

[1] Review, p. 16. [2] p. 10.

and ſeeming delight, his *diſcernment* muſt be admir'd; if he *wou'd not*, his *ſincerity*.

III.

To the deſcription of δαίμονες abovementi-on'd he immediately ſubjoineth this piece of inſtruction — *viz.* " For this ſenſe of δαίμονες " are cited *Plutarch, Porphyry, Jamblichus*"; and then politely adds — " all good writers, " but too modern by much for the thing to " be prov'd." [1] His own experience and conviction, undoubtedly, drew this courteſy from him; and the peculiar beauties of his ſtyle afford inconteſtable proof of his acquaintance with good writers. Well: but " *they* " *(Plutarch,* &c. as above) *are too modern by* " *much for the thing to be prov'd.*" A general aſſertion, you find, is the author's happy inſtrument of refuting, what he is unwilling to admit. But, before the teſtimony of thoſe, and of other writers, (mention'd alſo in the Sermon) who flouriſh'd after the promulgation of the Goſpel, be reſigned to his arbitrary exception againſt it, the reader is intreated to hear the following pleas in behalf of its validity — The author of the *Review* is (it cannot, ſurely, be too much to be preſum'd) ſo well acquainted with thoſe " good " writers," as to know, that they were heathens. He pretends not to deny, that *they* us'd the words δαίμων and δαιμόνιον, in the ſenſe, which is maintain'd in the Sermon. " 'Tis not deny'd, ſay'th he [2], that *after* the

[1] Review, *p.* 16. [2] Review, *ibid.*

" New

" New Teſtament Times, that Word (δαίμων) " was us'd in an ill Senſe; and the modern " *Platoniſts*, and Others, are full of ſuch a " Notion." Whence, then, can he imagin they deriv'd this uſe of the word? Certainly, he will not ſay, (tho' hard it is to determin, what he will not ſay) from the preachers of the Goſpel — *Lucian*, *Porphyry*, *Julian* and *Libanius* were the eminent free-thinkers of their times; and claim'd, without doubt, the title of *fair and rational inquirers*, even during their vehement oppoſition to the Goſpel. To the credentials, that had been produc'd in proof of its divine original, they were not ſtrangers. [1] *Julian* expreſsly attributeth to our Savior the miraculous fact of diſpoſſeſſing evil ſpirits; and *Lucian* ſuppoſeth that the ſame fact was commonly acknowledged. [2] Our Savior had alledged it as an argument of His divine miſſion. To His diſciples He had [3] promis'd ability to work the ſame miracle, in His name: and many of His meſſengers [4] reported to Him, that " even the devils were ſubject to them, thro' " His name." Inſtances of miraculous power, thus exercis'd, were not given in a corner: nor are they incidentally or ambiguouſly recorded by the Evangeliſts; but propos'd as evidences of a divine commiſſion, and expreſs'd in terms, which (according to the receiv'd rules of grammar and criticiſm) im-

[1] See Serm. p. 1. [2] *Matt.* xii. 28. and elſewhere. [3] *Mark* xvi. 17. and elſewhere. [4] *Luke* x. 17.

port,

port, that the perſons, in whoſe favour that power was exerted, had been poſſeſs'd by real, impure, ſpiritual Beings. When great ſtreſs, then, was alſo, in ſucceeding ages of Chriſtianity, lay'd on the ſame fact, and frequent appeals made to it, in ſupport of the Chriſtian cauſe; is it credible, that enemies ſo watchful, ſagacious and virulent, as *Lucian*, *Porphyry*, *Libanius* and *Julian* were, would have fail'd to ridicule and expoſe ſuch appeals, had they been capable of ſuppoſing, that any degree of fiction took place in the report of the fact appeal'd to, and that it was founded only upon, and adapted to, a miſtaken perſuaſion of the vulgar? Is it not much more credible, that they wou'd have triumph'd in the detection of the error, and urg'd the detected colluſion of Chriſtians in their pretences to *this* miracle, as an argument to depretiate the *reſt*; which were reported, by the ſame authors, to have been wrought in confirmation of the ſame doctrin? From this defeat of Chriſtians (had ſuch a defeat been poſſible) might have been collected a plauſible occaſion, at leaſt, of ſuggeſting, that the Evangelical relation of *other* miracles, was not to be interpreted according to the uſual acceptation of words, but to be regarded only as an artful accommodation of language to the groundleſs notions of the unthinking and illiterate. The *abilities* of the authors abovemention'd were, unqueſtionably, equal to the *diſcernment* of an impoſture of this kind: nor can it be doubted,

doubted, that their *enmity* to Chriſtianity wou'd have been ſufficient incentive to reproach (had there been room to reproach) the preachers of that religion, with deluding their hearers, by appeals to pretended facts; and with abuſing their credulity, by a deſign'd miſapplication of words.

It may now, 'tis hoped, be ſafely concluded, that the teſtimony of the authors (even of *Jamblichus* too, tho' not diſtinguiſh'd by any direct cavils againſt Chriſtianity) referr'd to in the Sermon, ſtandeth in full force, and ſufficiency to bear the ſtreſs, which is there lay'd upon it. The author of the *Review*, indeed, hath, in effect, confeſs'd it ſubverſive of his ſcheme; and, therefor, thought fit to interpoſe an exception to it. Yet, had thoſe very authors afforded *no* teſtimony, favorable to the uſual acceptation of the words diſcuſs'd, 'tis not improbable that the *Reviewer* (for, the *perverſe* and the *paradox* generally prevail together) wou'd have call'd for *their* authority, with a degree of earneſtneſs, equal to the contempt, with which he now regards it. Probable, at leaſt, it is, that if they had *favour'd* his cauſe, tho' in a much lower degree, than that, wherein they oppoſe it, he wou'd not only have applauded them, as "good writers", but as good *witneſſes* too, in the preſent debate.

IV.

His next ſentence, in the ſame page, appeareth thus — "But when the word (δαίμων)

"was

" was never us'd for malevolent Beings, 'till " ſuch a Time at leaſt; and then we find it us'd " often in a certain Book, and no Intimation " is given of its ſignifying in that Book *male-* " *volent Beings, delighting* in *promoting Wick-* " *edneſs*; what Neceſſity is there in that Book " ſo to underſtand it?"

Here is a ſtrange mixture of error and confuſion; which muſt, perhaps, be imputed to the Panic, into which that horrid " pomp of " references" had thrown him. In ſupport of the deſcription of δαίμονες, in the [1] Sermon, ſeveral Pagan authors are cited, by whoſe united teſtimony it is, in every part, ſupported. " But, ſay'th the *Reviewer*, " when the " Word was never us'd for malevolent Beings, " 'till ſuch a Time at leaſt; and then we find " it often us'd in a certain Book, *&c.*" What time? — the New Teſtament Time, that he talks of above? — And, will he not, then, allow that, in *that* time, a more full diſcovery of the ſpiritual world was made, than in any period antecedent to it? A more clear account of the Beings, call'd δαίμονες or δαιμόνια, may juſtly be eſteem'd a beneficial part of the diſcovery; ſeeing, their malignity, power and ſubtlety being made known, proper caution againſt their attempts is thereupon excited, and mankind more effectually induc'd to regard the creatures with abhorrence, which had ſome time uſurp'd the honour of adoration, due only to the Creator. Nor ſhou'd it be any

[1] pag. 10.

matter

matter of wonder, if they were more frequently ſpoken of in that time, wherein their nature and works were expoſed to light; and a divine power diſplay'd in the repreſſion of their malicious rage.

But, what is this *certain* book, of which he talks again and again, in the ſame ſentence? His language ſeems to intimate ſome obſcure, contemptible compoſition, which this judg of "good writing" diſdains to name.

V.

But, he thus proceeds — "Yes, but *Plato* "is produc'd as making the moſt pernicious "Deluſions the favourite Employment of "δαίμονες [1]."

This report, ſurely, was not form'd, to ſupport the title, which he aſſumes, and to realize his pretences to the *love of truth!* The paſſage of the Sermon, which the *Reviewer* repreſenteth, in his way, is this — "When "the ſame authors (authors referr'd to in the "Sermon) make the moſt pernicious deluſions "the favourite imployment of δαίμονες: when "they, [2] &c." Yet, *Plato* alone is named by the Reviewer, as if no other had been mention'd with him.

This piece of ingenuity is immediately follow'd by a moſt appoſite and rigorous interrogatory — "Do's *Plato* ever ſay ſo, *directly* "*and in Terms?*" In order to anſwer him,

[1] Review, *p.* 16, 17. [2] P. 11.

in ſome meaſure, according to his wiſdom, let me be permitted to aſk — Do I appeal to *Plato*, as ſaying ſo, *directly and in terms?* or, have I lay'd a ſtreſs on *Plato*'s *ſingle* authority? The *Reviewer* may here give occaſion to ſuſpect, that he was ſerious, and directed by the ſimplicity of his heart, when he talk'd of "margins ſtuff'd with the pomp "of references;" and that, during his diſturbance at the appearance, he fancy'd them deſign'd only for oſtentation, amuſement, or terror to elegant men, unaccuſtom'd to ſuch hideous ſights. An intelligent reader may be inclin'd to think them intended for another uſe, and ſuited to the ſubject under conſideration. Of the Beings deſcrib'd in the Sermon, the ſeveral authors, quoted in confirmation of the deſcription, had only imperfect notices. It was neceſſary, then, to *collect* their ſentiments, that all might jointly ſupply the light, which no one cou'd *ſeparately* ſupply.

Before we leave that acute queſtion of the Reviewer, may it not be properly inquir'd, why the teſtimony of *Plato* is call'd for *directly and in Terms?* Will not this cautious writer ſubſcribe his aſſent to any propoſition, the truth of which is not declar'd *directly and in Terms?* What refinements might be expected from him, ſhould he undertake to comment upon any important article of religion, receiv'd in our church?

VI. But,

VI.

But, he go'th on immediately to this obſervation, in the Sermon [1], — " When they (the " philoſophers there ſpoken of) pronounce " them (δαίμονες) the inventors and incouragers " of ſuch practices, as are moſt injurious both " to individuals and to communities of men; " they muſt, by neceſſary conſequence from " their own reaſoning — be preſum'd to look " upon δαίμονες, as extremely evil."

The Reviewer, in his tranſcript of this paſſage, hath quaintly diſtinguiſh'd — *preſum'd* — by Italic characters. Cou'd the authors, there pointed out, have furniſh'd him with any colour of argument, in defence of his own tenet; their ſenſe wou'd, undoubtedly, have receiv'd a better air from his pen; and a *demonſtration*, in his behalf, been rais'd out of ſuch materials, as he will not, at preſent, allow ſufficient to ſupport even a *preſumption* againſt him.

VII.

He aſks again, [2] " Where do's *Plato* pro- " nounce Demons to be the Inventors and " Incouragers of pernicious Deluſions?" And then he adds — " Mr. *H.* refers to *Plato* in " *Plutarch*, T. 2. p. [3] 36. Idem in *Phædro*, " p. 240. Confer. idem de Rep. l. 2. p. 364. " and 378 — 381 — 2. But in all theſe Places

[1] *p.* 11. [2] *P.* 17. [3] not there, but *p.* 361.

" there is not one Word about Demons en-
" couraging pernicious Deluſions." How is this *prov'd?* Why, as uſual — it is *affirm'd.* And, were the moſt peremptory concluſions the moſt pertinent too, who wou'd venture to gainſay him? But, his hardieſſe having already been expos'd, the juſtneſs of his preſent deciſion may reaſonably be ſuſpected; at leaſt, 'til all the places referr'd to, be duly conſider'd and compar'd. In the firſt, *Plato* (according to [1] *Plutarch*'s citation) forms a direct oppoſition between the characters of θεοὶ and δαίμονες; to the former attributing what is *favorable* or *benign* and *ſingularly excellent*; to the latter, the *contrary*. *Plato*, then, herein juſtifyeth ſome part of the deſcription of δαίμονες, in the Sermon. And, had the *Reviewer* thought fit to have taken proper notice of *Xenocrates*'s opinion, which *Plutarch* immediately ſubjoineth to that of *Plato*, the ſcholar might have given him a clearer idea of the maſter's ſentiments, and ſupply'd ſome other diſtinguiſhing features, which belong to the Beings there ſpoken of. The expediency of paying attention to what was added, in *Plutarch*, to *Plato*'s words, is plainly ſuggeſted in the very next ſentence of the Sermon, which beginneth thus — " and " *Plutarch* ſuppoſeth, that ſeveral inquiſitive " heathens (whom he citeth as conſentient " with *Plato* herein) were juſtly led [2], *&c.*"

[1] — θεοῖς τὰ δεξια καὶ πρεπτὰ, τὰ δ' ἀντίφωνα τούτων δαίμοσιν ἀποδίδωσι. [2] P. 11.

The

The *Reviewer* might hence have learn'd to acknowledge, that I have not appeal'd to *Plato* immediately, in the firſt reference, but to *Plutarch*'s repreſentation of his thoughts. And, [1] *Plutarch* having produc'd him as agreeing with ſeveral other philoſophers in the notion of φαῦλοι δαίμονες, it might not have miſbecame a *Reviewer*, to have conſider'd, in this part of his *Review*, what thoſe other philoſophers had alſo ſay'd upon the Subject. In *Plutarch*, their accounts were properly plac'd together; and, thro' the aſſemblage, improve the light and ſtrength of each other. But, our author having judg'd it more convenient for him to poſtpone the evidences of *Empedocles* and *Xenocrates*, I ſhall follow him in his own way, and proceed to

VIII.

The next reference, made immediately to *Plato*, in *Phædro*, p. 240. The words of the place declare a variety of evils, with moſt of which an immediate or preſent pleaſure had been intermingled by ſome δαίμων [2]. The pleaſure intermix'd hath the appearance of an allurement to thoſe evils. The author, therefor, of it (ſome δαίμων) may juſtly be call'd the inventor or incourager, at leaſt, of a pernicious deluſion; if, thro' his propoſal of a preſent pleaſure, men might be induc'd to in-

[1] As cited in the Sermon, p 11.

[2] Ἐσι μὲ δὴ κ) ἄλλα κακά· ἀλλά τις ἔμιξε δαίμων τοῖς πλείσοις ἐν τῷ παραυτίκα ἡδονῷ.

volve

volve themſelves in guilt. According to the uſe which [1] *Clemens Alexandrinus* hath made of this paſſage of *Plato*, (and this philoſopher might be, perhaps, as well underſtood by that Father, as by the *Reviewer*) the δαίμων, therein ſpoken of, was either ὁ θρυλλούμενος διάβολος, or ſome immediate vaſſal and agent of that ἄρχων τῶν δαιμόνων.

IX.

The next references to *Plato* are thus propos'd — " Confer. idem de Repub. l. 2. p. 364. " & p. 378 — 381 — 2. [2]" Here the *Reviewer* ſhould have attended to the *manner*, in which theſe references are made. *Plato* is not therein cited, as offering *direct*, *indubitable* evidence, in regard to the preſent ſubject of debate; but, a *collation* of him with the other authors, referr'd to at the ſame time, is recommended to the reader. And, with what pertinence this office was recommended, a brief ſurvey of the paſſages will evince.

In the firſt, which occurreth l. 2. de Rep. p. 364. the ἀγύρται and μάντεις are charg'd with attempting to delude, not only ſome few individuals, but whole ſtates, into a perſuaſion, that they were inabl'd by the θεοὶ, (whoſe aid they pretended to ingage, by ἐπῳδαὶ, θυσίαι, ἐπαγωγαί τινες) to clear men from the dangerous conſequences of any wrongs, whereof

[1] *Strom. l.* 5. *p.* 701, *& ſeq. Edit. Oxon.*
[2] Serm. *p.* 11.

they

they had been guilty. That the φαῦλοι or πονηροὶ δαίμονες might incourage their votaries, to make an attempt of this pernicious nature, [1] *Porphyry* and [2] *Jamblichus* will authoriſe us to maintain. And thoſe Beings, as the [3] former alſo obſerveth, βέλον᾽ εἶναι θεοὶ, — and according to the latter — ὑποκρίνον᾽ τὴν τῶν θεῶν παρουσίαν. It may ſtill, then, ſeem probable, that by θεοὶ, in this paſſage of *Plato*, δαίμονες are to be underſtood; eſpecially ſeeing this uſe of θεοὶ is ſay'd by *Proclus* (no incompetent judg of *Plato*'s language) to obtain in many places of that author.

X.

In the next paſſage, extant p. 378, are mention'd the extreme injuſtice, unnatural cruelty, and diſcord amongſt the θεοὶ, continu'd either by inſidious practices or by open violence. The imputation, indeed, of ſuch enormities to the θεοὶ is there condemn'd; as capable of producing ill impreſſions on the minds of the young eſpecially, and propagating wrong notions of the Beings, commonly diſtinguiſh'd by that name. But, ſuppoſing δαίμονες to be here intended by it, the tranſactions will be, in ſome degree, ſuitable (as thoſe were, which the former paſſage records) to *ſuch* agents; and the narration found to contain ſome footſteps of truth. Nor is this ſuppoſition groundleſs. *Plutarch*, having mention'd facts, which

[1] *de abſt. l. 2. ſect. 41 & ſeq.* [2] *de myſt. Sect.* iv. c. 7.
[3] *loco cit.*

reſemble

reſemble theſe, [1] ſay'th that they were more properly attributed to δαίμονες, than either to θεοὶ, or to ἄνθρωποι: and citeth *Plato*, *Pythagoras*, *Xenocrates*, and *Chryſippus*, as concurring in the ſame opinion. The opinion ſeemeth to have been founded upon a juſt perſuaſion, that, in the facts, to which it relateth, were imply'd ſuch guilt and ſuffering, as cou'd not be aſcribed to θεοί: and ſuch power, as belongeth not to human nature. *Plato*, then, having (according to *Plutarch*) attributed the like facts to δαίμονες, may, not improbably, be thought to have intended the ſame Beings, in this paſſage; where he mentions the ſtories, concerning the various diſſenſions and wars of θεοὶ, and pronounceth them improperly apply'd to the Beings, which θεοὶ was ſuppos'd to denote.

XI.

In pages 381 — 2 of *Plato*, it is inquir'd, whether the θεοὶ may, in ſome caſes, be eſteem'd ἐξαπατῶντες καὶ γοητεύοντες? And, in the anſwer, (*viz.* Ι Σ Ω Σ) it is imply'd, that the acts, ſpecify'd in the inquiry, had been, or might, without abſurdity, be attributed to them. But the anſwer implyeth not only, what is not abſurd, but alſo what is ſtrictly true, provided δαίμονες be here likewiſe comprehended in the term θεοί. By thoſe (according to *Porphyry* [2]) ἡ πᾶσα γοητεία ἐκτελεῖται

[1] *T.* 2. p. 360. [2] *de abſt. l.* 2. *ſect.* 41, 42. compare *Jamblich. & Liban.* as cited in Serm. p. 11.

πωλήρεις

πλήρεις γὰρ πάσης φαντασίας οὗτοι, καὶ ἀπατῆσαι ἱκανοὶ διὰ τῆς τερατουργίας — τὸ γὰρ ψεῦδος τούτοις οἰκεῖον. But the [1] *Reviewer* obſerves, that "*Plato* condemns *Homer*, and other Poets, "for ſuch figments, and adds, Πάντη ἄρα "ἀψευδὲς τὸ δαιμόνιόν τε καὶ τὸ θεῖον." Elated with this ſentence, he proceeds, after a ſhort intermiſſion, to aſk, "Is it not a very ſtrong "argument to prove that *Plato* thought *De-* "*mons* Encouragers of *Frauds* and *Deluſions*, "that he expreſsly ſays, *The nature of Gods* "*and Demons is altogether free from Delu-* "*ſions?*"

The ſentence, Πάντη ἄρα, &c. ſeemeth to be a concluſion, deſign'd to rectify miſtakes, in the preceding debate. And, as no expreſs mention had before been made of δαίμονες, or the δαιμόνιον γένος, it appeareth, that they were rightly ſuppos'd to be comprehended in the term θεοὶ, during the courſe of the diſpute; ſeeing they make part of the ſubject, in the concluſion. Well: but is not the concluſion directly contrary to the notion of δαίμονες, maintain'd in the Sermon? No: in the Sermon it is prov'd, that δαίμονες repreſenteth good, as well as evil ſpirits: of the former this concluſion is to be underſtood; whil'ſt the latter are, 'tis probable, meant by θεοὶ, where it is intimated, that ἐξαπάτη and γοητεία were not thought inconſiſtent with their nature.

[1] P. 17.

XII.

But, after Πάντη ἄρα ἀψόδες, &c. in the [1] *Review*, the next ſentence we read is this, — "Mr. *H.* was ſo far conſcious of this, that "he has put this Note immediately after the "References before mention'd, *viz.* "Where "indeed, HE *(Plato)* uſeth the Word θεοὶ; "yet δαίμονες, 'tis PROBABLE, are to be un-"derſtood by it:" Why ſo? FOR, thus *Proclus* ſays, "that *Plato, in many places*, calls "*Demons, Gods*: Ergo, in this Place." Thus can the *Reviewer* rally or reaſon, you ſee, with equal felicity. Conſcious of this — what? — "that in all theſe places, (as he is pleas'd to "ſay) there is not one Word *about Demons* "*encouraging pernicious Deluſions?*" Such a conſciouſneſs might, 'tis true, reſult from the peruſal of thoſe places, by a perſon of our *Reviewer*'s ſkill and penetration. In me, who pretend not to the like abilities, they produc'd a different perſuaſion. And, not the note only, whereof the *Reviewer* ſpeaks, but each reference may ſhew, that I was conſcious of what I had read, and of what I wrote: conſcious, that I had not attempted to abuſe my reader, [2] by *diverting his attention from clear to conteſtable evidence*, — that I had not made an indiſcriminate claim to *Plato*'s ſuffrage; but only in *one* inſtance ap-

[1] P. 17. See Serm. p. 11.
[2] See Review, p. 16, 17. compar'd with Remark V.

peal'd

appeal'd immediately to him; in *another*, upon *Plutarch*'s report; and, in regard to all the other references, wherein his name occurs, ſuggeſted the expediency of *comparing* the tenor of his language with that of *Plutarch*, of *Porphyry*, of *Jamblichus* and of *Libanius*; all cited at the ſame time, with the ſame deſign. I was alſo conſcious, that theſe authors did not only place the tenet, in ſupport of which they are quoted, above all danger of juſt exception; but that they might likewiſe, upon compariſon with the three laſt paſſages of *Plato*, afford ſome ground of probability, that theſe, or ſome of theſe, *Proclus* had in view, when he obſerv'd, that *Plato*, in *many* places, apply'd to δαίμονες the appellation of θεοί. To one conſcious of theſe ſeveral points, it was needleſs, as well as unbecoming and abſurd, firſt to form conjectural premiſes, and then preſs an illative particle to introduce a peremptory concluſion.

XIII.

From *Plato* the author of the *Review* [1] advanceth to *Empedocles*; and aſketh, "How "does it hence appear (from *Empedocles*'s "verſes, I ſuppoſe) that *Demons* were con- "ceiv'd by *Empedocles* to be *malevolent Be-* "*ings delighting or delighted* (thus is he "pleas'd with repeating his own Abſurdity) "*in promoting wickedneſs?* He imagin'd, in-

[1] Review, p. 19. and again p. 37.

 "deed,

" deed, that if *Demons were guilty of any* " crimes, *they were* puniſh'd by *ſtrange re-* " *volutions 'till they were purify'd; and then* " *they were reſtor'd to their own natural Re-* " *gion and Order.* But what is this to *ma-* " *levolent, maleficent Beings, promoting Mi-* " *ſery among men?*" And — " what is all " this to evil Demons or Devils wand'ring " thro' the Air, about Sea and Land, and " ſtriving with Aſſiduity and Fierceneſs to " *delude Men into Ruin, and actually making* " *ſome of the Species their Prey?*

Here the *Reviewer* wou'd inſinuate, (according to his uſual ingenuity) that the deſcription of δαίμονες, in the Sermon, was founded on *Empedocles*'s authority alone: and then his accumulated, ſevere demands prove, (as clearly as any reaſonable man can expect him to prove) that the deſcription can receive no confirmation from the verſes of that philoſopher. Yet, concerning their import *Plutarch* ſeemeth to have entertain'd a different opinion. In one of the pages, wherein [1] he hath preſerv'd them, an expreſs diſtinction, between χρησοὶ and φαῦλοι δαίμονες, had been premis'd. And, after *Plato*'s, *Xenocrates*'s and *Heſiod*'s accounts of thoſe Beings, it is added, Εμπεδοκλῆς ὴ κ δίκας φησὶ διδόναι τὰς δαίμονας ὧν ἐξαμάρτωσι κ πλημμελήσωσι —

[1] *Plutarch.* T. 2. p. 361.

Αἰθέ-

Αἰθέριον μὲν γάρ σφε μέθω, &c. as in the Sermon [1]? Here they are repreſented as rejected with deteſtation, in all parts of the viſible world; and regarded as the objects of univerſal horror. And, will not this repreſentation contribute, in ſome degree, to evince their *malevolence* and *maleficence?* Ill-fated Beings, ſurely, if every where treated with extreme abhorrence; whilſt free from the guilt of all πλημμελήματα, which might argue their malignity towards man, or inſolence towards the Deity! But, the *Reviewer* (led by his exuberant benevolence to perpetual ſolicitude about their welfare and credit) [2] tells you from *Plutarch*, that "when Demons "*ſinn'd*, they underwent ſevere Puniſhments, "toſs'd from the Air to the Sea, from Sea to "Earth, from Earth to the Sun, from the Sun "to the Air, till being thus puniſh'd and "purify'd, they again obtain their natural "Region and Order." It is readily allow'd, that a miſtaken notion, concerning the duration of their puniſhment and final allotment, might eaſily be entertain'd by Pagan philoſophers. But, beſides the words, wherein the opinion, about their reſtoration to their natural order, is expreſs'd, thoſe alſo, which immediately follow in *Plutarch*, might have deſerv'd the conſideration of the *Reviewer*. Thus *Plutarch* then proceeds [3] — Τούτων δ' ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων ἀδελφὰ λέγεσθαί φασι περὶ Τυφῶνος, ὡς δεινὰ μὲν

[1] P. 12, and about the cloſe of this remark.
[2] Review, p. 37. and before, in p. 19.
[3] P. 361. τῶν

τοῦ φθόνου καὶ δυσμενείας εἰργάσατο· καὶ πάντα τοιαῦτα παρέξας, ἐνέπλησε κακῶν γῆν ὁμοῦ τε πᾶσαν καὶ θάλασσαν, εἶτα δίκην ἔδωκεν — i. e. *It is ſay'd, that there are relations concerning* Typhon, *which bear a very near reſemblance to theſe and the like* (*viz.* what had been juſt before produc'd, in the verſes of *Empedocles*) importing, *that he, thro' envy and malignity, committed horrible crimes; and that, having caus'd a general perturbation, he at the ſame time fill'd both the whole earth and ſea with calamities, and afterwards was puniſh'd.* Shou'd the *Reviewer* be here tempted (as he is accuſtom'd) ſhrewdly to inquire, "How "does it hence appear, that Demons were "conceiv'd by *Empedocles* to be *malevolent*, "*maleficent Beings*, delighting in promoting "*wickedneſs*, or in *promoting Miſery among* "*Men?* —" I muſt take leave to anſwer, that, in *Plutarch*'s opinion, it doth hence appear, that *Empedocles*'s deſcription importeth ſuch a notion of them; ſeing he ſay'th, in the paſſage already cited, that between this deſcription, and the relations concerning *Typhon*, there is a very near reſemblance. Well: but what are the reports about *Typhon* to the purpoſe? muſt harmleſs δαίμονες be traduc'd, becauſe that monſter hath met with his deſerved character? Here I muſt again take leave to interpoſe the judgment of *Plutarch*, in order to ward off the expoſtulations of the *Reviewer*; and to produce his words[1] —

[1] Referr'd to in Remark X.

[1] Βέλτιον

Βέλτιον — οἱ τὰ περὶ τὸν Τυφῶνα — ἱστορούμενα μήτε θεῶν παθήματα μήτε ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ δαιμόνων μεγάλων, εἶναι νομίζοντες, ὡς καὶ Πλάτων καὶ Πυθαγόρας καὶ Ξενοκράτης καὶ Χρύσιππος, ἑπόμενοι τοὺς πάλαι θεολόγους, ἐρρωμενεστέρους μὲν ἀνθρώπων γεγονέναι λέγουσι, κ. τ. λ.[2] i. e. *The opinion of those deserveth preferenee, who, thinking that the things, recorded of* Typhon; *imply such passions and incidents, as agree not either to gods or men, but to great demons, as* Plato, *and* Pythagoras, *and* Xenocrates, *and* Chrysippus *thought, assenting to antient divines, say that they* (demons) *are more powerful than men,* &c.

What the things were, which the accounts of *Typhon* contain'd, page the 22d will shew; and, at the same time, so far confirm what is said of δαίμονες in the Sermon, as to leave nothing more to be supply'd, than what may be easily collected from other authors, quoted in the same place.

Before we leave the verses of *Empedocles*, it may be observ'd, that the *Reviewer* affects

[2] *Plutarch*, T. 2. p. 360. where these words immediately follow —— καὶ πολλῇ τῇ δυνάμει τὴν φύσιν ὑπερφέροντας ἡμῶν, τὸ δὲ θεῖον οὐκ ἀμιγὲς, οὐδὲ ἄκρατον ἔχοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχῆς φύσει καὶ σώματος αἰσθήσει ἐν συνειληκὸς, ἡδονὴν δεχομένην καὶ πόνον καὶ ὅσα ταύταις ἐγγενόμενα ταῖς μεταβολαῖς πάθη, τοὺς μὲν μᾶλλον, τοὺς δὲ ἧττον ἐπιταράττει. These are here added for the sake of proposing a reformation of them. Instead then, of — αἰσθήσει ἐν συν— it might be better to read — αἰσθήσει ἓν συν— Instead of — δεχομένην — to read — δεχομένῃ — Instead of — ἐπιταράττει — to read — ἐπιταράττειν. The *Reviewer*, perhaps, may find the passage cited by an antient Christian writer, and then pretend, that he thence produc'd the true reading of it.

to

to cite them (not from *Plutarch*, p. 361. where they first occur, but) from *Plutarch*, p. 830. And, proving that he now had pretty well conquer'd the fastitium or fright, which a "pomp of references" had formerly rais'd, he grow'th familiar with them; and bravely thus presenteth the reader with the following lines [1].

Αἰθέριον μὲν γάρ σφε μένος πόντόνδε διώκει·
Πόντος δ' ἐς χθονὸς ὕδας ἀπέπτυσε· γαῖα δ' ἐς αὔγας
Ηελίου ἀκάμαντος· ὁ δ' αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε δίναις
Αλλος δ' ἐξ ἄλλου δέχεται ςυγέουσι δὲ πάντες.

and adds, "Thus *Plutarch* gives us these "Lines in his Treatise *De vitando ære alie-* "*no*, *p*. 830." Do's he so? Alas! these same references have drawn a sort of vengeance upon our author; and, in aggravation of it, have made his own "eyes and hands" the instruments of exposing the rashness of his pretences to familiarity with them. In the 830th and 831st pages of *Plutarch*, the lines above cited, appear exactly thus—

Αἰθέριον μὲν γάρ σφε μένος πόντονδε διώκει.
Πόντος ἢ χθονὸς ὕδας ἀνέπτυσε· γαῖα δ' ἐς αὐγὰς
Ηελίου ἀκάμαντος, ὅδ' αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε δίναις.

Thus ends *p*. 830. and then immediately, in *p*. 831. follow, ἄλλον δ' ἐξ ἄλλου δέχεται τοκι-

[1] Review, *p*. 37.

ςὴς ἢ κ. τ. λ. in *Plutarch*'s plain proſe. About falſe ſtops and falſe accents I propoſe no queſtion. But, why did he tell his reader, "Thus (or as he hath exhibited them) *Plu-* "*tarch* gives us theſe Lines in his Treatiſe" &c. whereas, in *Plutarch* we read — Πόντος δ' χθονὸς ὕδας ἀνέπτυσε — in the *Reviewer*'s copy — Πόντος δ' ἐς χθονὸς ὕδας ἀπέπτυσε — in *Plutarch* — αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε δίναις — is follow'd by — ἄλλων δ' ἐξ ἄλλυ δέχεται τοκιςὴς ἢ κ. τ. λ. in the *Reviewer*'s copy — by

Αλλος δ' ἐξ ἄλλυ δέχεται ςυγέυσι δὲ πάντες.

If it can, after all, be ſuppos'd, that he really tranſcrib'd thoſe verſes from p. 830 of *Plutarch*; yet, might it ſtill ſeem ſtrange, (cou'd any thing be ſtrange, in the conduct of ſuch a writer) that the clauſe, which immediately precedeth them, ſhou'd be paſs'd by, without the notice of a *Reviewer*. Therein are mention'd οἱ θεήλατοι καὶ ὐρανοπετεῖς ἐκεῖνοι τοῦ Εμπεδοκλέυς δαίμονες. The epithets are remarkable; and might have reminded our author of paſſages in a *certain* book, relating to certain Beings, vulgarly call'd fall'n angels. Amongſt theſe muſt the δαίμονες and δαιμόνια of the New Teſtament be left, in defiance of all his attempts to reſcue them. And, whether he will acknowledg it or not, the characters of *malevolence* and *maleficence* ſtand fix'd indelibly upon the Beings ſo call'd, in profane as well as ſacred authors.

XIV.

Xenocrates is the only witneſs, whoſe evidence remaineth undefended. And the paſſage, in which it is expreſs'd, is thus produc'd by the *Reviewer* — [1] δυσρόπες καὶ ζκυθρωπὰς, αἳ χαίρεσι τοιέτοις, (*viz.* writes the *Reviewer*) ἡμερῶν ἀποφράδας ϗ τῶν ἑορτῶν ὅσαι ωληγάς τινας, ἢ κοπετὰς, ἢ νηςείας, ἢ δυσφημίας, ἢ αἰσχρολογίαν ἔχεσιν) καὶ τυ∫χάνεσαι ωρὸς ἀθὲν ἄλλο χεῖρον τρέπον). The reader will be eaſily led, by this admirable grammatical ſtructure of the words, to ſuſpect, that the *Reviewer* muſt here have meddled with language, of which he had only a ſlender knowledg. In *Plutarch* [2] we read thus — Ο ὁ Ξενοκράτης ϗ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὰς ἀποφράδας ϗ τῶν ἑορ∫ῶν ἅσαι ωληγάς τινας, ἢ κοπε∫ὰς, ἢ νηςείας, ἢ δυσφημίας, ἢ αἰσχρολογίαν ἔχεσιν, ἅτε θεῶν τιμαῖς ἅτε δαιμόνων οἴεται ωροσήκειν χρηςῶν· ἀλλὰ εἶναι φύσεις ἐν τῷ ωερίεχον∫ι μεγάλας μὲν ϗ ἰσχυρὰς, δυσρόπες ὁ ϗ ζκυθρωπὰς, αἳ χαίρεσι τοῖς τοιέτοις, ϗ τυ∫χάνεσαι ωρὸς ἀθὲν ἄλλο χεῖρον τρέπον). Herein are recounted ſeveral hurtful, infamous practices, which *Xenocrates* judg'd to be unſuitable methods of honouring either the deities or good demons; and alſo declar'd to be the delight of thoſe vaſt, powerful, malign and gloomy Beings, (call'd above φαῦλοι δαίμονες) which inhabit the air. But, the *Reviewer* thus gently repreſenteth the ſenſe of the place —

[1] Review, *p.* 36. [2] De Iſ. & Oſ. *p.* 361.

" *Xeno-*

" [1] *Xenocrates* indeed talk'd of *gloomy*, *morose* " Demons that rejoice in such days, in which " Men smote their Breasts, mourned, and " fasted; and if they *have but these*, they " turn to *nothing worse*." — *have but these* — what must become, then, of δυσφημίαι and αἰσχρολογία? why were *they* suppress'd in the *Reviewer*'s account? The phrases — *have but these* — and — *nothing worse* — he hath distinguish'd by Italics; as if he thought his demons thereby sufficiently vindicated. But, what *worse* wou'd the *Reviewer* have? Is there not sufficient *moral malignity* (as he calls it) here pointed out, when the tenor of the whole passage is consider'd, and compar'd with another of the same purport, in *Plutarch* [2], referr'd to likewise in the Sermon? Surely, even the *Reviewer* must, upon second thoughts, be inclin'd to acknowledg, that a delight in receiving such tokens of veneration from deluded mortals, as consisted in wounding their bodies, in sinister and obscene expressions, may argue a disposition directly contrary to (permit me thus far to imitate, for the sake of opposing, him) *moral benignity*. He seemeth conscious, it must be own'd, that this single testimony is intirely

[1] Review, *p.* 36, 37.

[2] De def. orac. *p.* 417. ἑορτὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας, ὥσπερ ἡμέρας ἀπιφράδας καὶ σκυθρωπὰς, ἐν αἷς ὠμοφαγίαι καὶ διασπασμοὶ, νηστεῖαί τε καὶ κοπετοὶ, πολλαχοῦ δὲ πάλιν αἰσχρολογίαι πρὸς ἱεροῖς, μανίαι τε ἄλλαι ὀρινόμεναι ῥιψαύχενι σὺν κλόνῳ, θεῶν μὲν οὐδενὶ, δαιμόνων δὲ φαύλων ἀπιτροπῆς ἕνεκα φήσαιμ' ἂν τελεῖν μειλίχια καὶ παραμύθια· κ. τ. λ.

ſufficient to expoſe all his cavils: and ſay'th, (in deſpair, as it were, of bringing off his clients) " Take this Hypotheſis — take this, " I ſay, and ſtill, I aſk, what Evidence have " you for *morally malignant* Beings among " the antients?" Then he immediately and happily thus anſwereth himſelf, " *Xenocrates*, " who was himſelf a dark, gloomy Fellow." Such is the conſequence of fixing a bad character on our author's " *good demons, departed* " *ſouls, vanities, nothings*;" — the true *Engliſh*, in that noble *Theſaurus*, whereby he is govern'd, for δαίμονες or δαιμόνια! *Xenocrates* was, unqueſtionably, a ſorry, impertinent fellow — For, who, except ſuch a fellow, wou'd have talk'd in that manner againſt thoſe Beings, before he knew, what pleas wou'd be offer'd in their behalf, by their ſtrenuous patrons in ſucceeding ages? And, a *dark* fellow too he was, — 'tis plain enough — his language was *Greek*. Beſides, *Laertius* ſeems to be call'd upon to prove, that he deſerv'd an ill-name. For, thus ends the *Review*, *Erratum*, p. 37. for σκυθρὸπως, *Laertius* read σκυθρωπὸς, vid. *Laertius*. Our author muſt here be adviſ'd to conſider what was ſay'd above [1], concerning references to authors. Exactneſs in making them may be reaſonably expected from all writers; and, from thoſe of his own claſs, is indiſpenſably requir'd, in order to leſſen, in ſome degree,

[1] Remark 1.

the

the drudgery of purſuing them. He had in view, it may be ſuppos'd, *Laert.* l. 4. ſegm. 6. where *Xenocrates* is call'd Ζεμνὸς καὶ Ζκυθρωπός. What *concluſions* the *Reviewer* will allow to be drawn from the *countenance*, it may not be eaſy to ſay. Yet, the gravity and auſterity, which appear'd in *Xenocrates*, can hardly be thought ſufficient to invalidate his authority; eſpecially, when the excellent character, by which he is diſtinguiſh'd in *Laertius* [1], and other authors, (cited by the commentators) ſhall have been duly conſider'd.

XV.

The authorities cited in the Sermon, in ſupport of the uſual interpretation of δαίμων and δαιμόνιον, may be now thought abundantly vindicated from the cavils and general negatives of the *Reviewer*. Yet ſtill muſt not the reader be deny'd the diverſion of beholding our author triumph, as it were, in his own defeat. No ſooner had *Xenocrates* been diſmiſs'd, than he thus courageouſly proceedeth [2]— "But what *Evidence* is there for even "ſuch a Notion? — (as that philoſopher en- "tertain'd of δαίμονες, I ſuppoſe, he means) "In the firſt Place, the whole Hypotheſis is "mere Fiction. In the ſecond Place, there "was no Notion of ſuch *malevolent* Beings as "delighted in *promoting wickedneſs*. And "thirdly, not a word of their poſſeſſing Men,

[1] Loco cit. & ſegm. ſeq. [2] Review *p.* 38.

"and

" and inflicting Miſery upon them, or wan-
" dring thro' the Air, and Earth and Sea, for
" any ſuch Purpoſe."

See, with what matchleſs proweſs do's he ſurmount all difficulties, and lay his opponents proſtrate, at every ſtep he takes! what wonderful execution may be done with a ſtile, directed by " eyes and hands ", like his? And, who will dare to reſiſt any arguments of this formidable tenor? For my part, I was inclin'd to be thankful to him, for ſuſpending his notice of me, whil'ſt all his other adverſaries feel the heavy effects of his ability, thro' a courſe of many pages — which they, perhaps, may be tempted to call one tedious parentheſis.

But, 'tis vain to expect any laſting ſecurity, from the aſſaults of ſo reſolute an enemy. In the 64th page he returns to take a parting ſtroke: and, ſenſible wherein his main ſtrength lyeth, he very rhetorically pronounceth his adverſaries guilty of making " ſuch reflexions
" as are unworthy of Men, and moſt un-
" worthy of Preachers of the Goſpel." How doth he *prove* his charge? with much eaſe — he boldly *pronounceth* it. But, hath he not confirm'd it by adding, that the " Goſpel
" teacheth a Charity, that *thinketh no Evil,*
" *and hopeth all things.*" A flagrant violation of that charity, undoubtedly, which the Goſpel injoineth, to expoſe the attempts, that are made to pervert it's language, and ſubject it to the capricious humour of every enemy

enemy to its purity! But, thus antiſcripturiſts, not contented with invading hiſtorical parts of the ſacred volume, ſeem reſolv'd to extend their violence even to the divine rules of practice, by crude, perverſe applications.

Mr. *Twells*'s Anſwer to the *Enquirer*, *&c.* and the *Eſſay* in vindication of the literal ſenſe *&c.* (which I have read with pleaſure) ſeem no otherwiſe obnoxious to the *Reviewer*'s calumny, than as they contain confutations of his tenet. Of the reflexion, in the Sermon, wherewith he is offended, enough hath been ſay'd in the Preface. His rage is now kindl'd: and, as it's bounds may not be eaſily fix'd, forbearance, in this caſe, becometh charity to him. I wou'd only, therefor, improve the charity, with an expreſſion of hope, that (ſhou'd his *hands* be again imploy'd upon the ſubject) he may be able to ſhew the conqueſt of his tranſports, by publiſhing, inſtead of a *ſecond Review* of the like tenor, a retractation of the *firſt*.

F I N I S.